OFFICE OF TRANSCE REFUND BRANCH

Def KRef Looin 307

06-13-03

States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to 21 1 2 2 1 Client Ref. No.: 51838AUSMI Assistant Commissioner for Patents #131 Reg for

Washington, D.C. 20231

US PATENT & TRADEWARK

4-7-03

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Unassigned Examiner:

Alan R. Brooks, et al.

Art Unit: 1645

Application No.: 09/803,472

REQUEST FOR REFUND

Filed: March 9, 2001

For: NOVEL ESTROGEN-REGULATED G PROTEIN GAMMA SUBUNIT: COMPOSITIONS AND

METHODS OF USE

Commissioner for Patents and Trademarks Box 16 Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

On January 24, 2003, Applicants mailed a Communication Under 37

C.F.R. $\S\S~1.821\text{-}1.825$ and Preliminary Amendment and related documents to the U.S.

Patent and Trademark Office in response to the Notice to Comply with Requirements for Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence and/or Amino Acid Sequence

Disclosures dated September 26, 2002. Copies of these documents are enclosed. Previously, on August 27, 2001, Applicants had mailed a Communication

Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821-1.825 and Preliminary Amendment and related documents to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in response to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application dated April 27, 2001. Copies of these documents are also enclosed.

410.00

Alan R. Brooks, et al. Application No.: 09/803,472 Page 2

Upon receipt of the Notice dated September 26, 2002, Applicants entered the Notice in queue for processing. A week before the November 26, 2002 deadline, Applicants began processing that Notice. At that time, Applicants noted that a sequence listing with amendment had previously been submitted. Applicants then phoned the Office of Initial Patent Examiners and spoke with Ms. Roxanne Rawls. Ms. Rawls requested that we send a copy of the return-receipt postcard for the papers mailed on August 27, 2001. Upon her further review, it was determined that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office had received the Communication, Response to Missing Parts, and related documents mailed on August 27. These documents had then been sent to a third-party government contractor that processes sequence listings for the USPTO.

We then phoned the third-party contractor and spoke with Anne Corrigan, who informed us that they had not received the above-mentioned sequence listing, which is why the September 26, 2002 Notice was issued.

A further conversation with Ms. Roxanne Rawls indicated that there was an internal USPTO record showing that the sequence listing had been mailed to the third-party contractor. She also informed us that since we had gone more than 1 1/2 months past the November 26, 2002 due date for determining whether a response was necessary, we should immediately submit a response to the September 26, 2002 Notice and request a refund for the extension of time fees.

Therefore, it is Applicants' belief that the requirements of 37 C.F.R.

1.821(e) had been timely satisfied on August 27, 2001. Due to an internal mistake
between the USPTO and the third-party contractor, a second response had to be filed. In
addition, the process of determining whether or not Applicants had to incur the time and
expense for reply to the second Notice caused the Applicants to take a two-month
extension of time.

Applicants, therefore, request that the USPTO refund the fees submitted with the January 24, 2003 mailing, totaling 10. Please credit these fees to Deposit Account No. 20-1430. This Request is submitted in duplicate.

Alan R. Brooks, et al. Application No.: 09/803,472 Page 3

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugenia Garrett-Wackowski Rek. Ng. 37,338

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 925-472-5000 Fax: 415-576-0300 EgW:lls

SF 1446819 v1